

## **REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully traverse and request reconsideration.

Applicants have added a new claim for consideration. Support can be found throughout the Specification, including, but not limited to, pages 16-18. New claim 33 requires, among other things, accessing information from different data sources and translating the information to a common format and adding metadata as contextual data to the data components from the different data sources. As such, data from different databases may nonetheless be evaluated and combined in a desired manner although these sources of databases may have data in different formats and be from different domains, such as a person's home computer or a person's work computer or automobile (see, for example, FIG. 6). This enhanced data having a common format also includes the data that indicates rules and other information so that access to the information may be suitably controlled as desired. The cited references do not appear to teach or suggest the claimed subject matter.

Applicants will address the rejections out of order to reiterate the discussions between the Examiner and Applicants' attorney, in an effort to expedite prosecution. Claims 11, 13, 16-18 and 29-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Alexander in view of Muryes et al.

With respect to claims 16-20, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration as noted above since the Muryes reference does not teach, among other things, receiving content...that includes terms of at least one service and determining whether the terms of said at least one service are acceptable. The office action cites paragraphs 159, 166 and 191 of Muryes. However, none of these cited paragraphs discuss "terms of service" as alleged in the office action and as such, Muryes does not teach, among other things, receiving content that includes terms of

at least one service nor a system that determines whether the terms of the service are acceptable. Accordingly, claims 16-20 are in condition for allowance.

The rejection of claims 1-6, 9, 10, 12, 21-24, and 26-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Alexander (U.S. Patent No. 6,732,331) was maintained. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as follows.

With respect to independent claim 1, Applicants maintain that Alexander does not teach or suggest all of the elements of this claim as argued in Applicants' previous response filed on November 4, 2004. Furthermore, in response to the arguments presented in the present final Office Action, Applicants submit the following arguments addressing each of these arguments as they relate to claim 1.

In paragraph 3.1 of the Office Action, the assertion is made that Alexander indeed teaches the claimed element of "access to a discrete data component from a data source." In support, col. 4, lines 44-49 and col. 12, lines 12-14, as well as Figure 1 of Alexander are cited as teaching this element. The cited sections, however, merely speak to the fact that Alexander discloses a content management framework to manage the arrangement, composition, and display attributes of web page content and that Extensible Markup Language (XML) content is persisted to a file while metadata about the content is stored in the database 21. These sections, however, do not actually teach "access to a discrete component of data from at least one data source," but actually relate to pushing content to a file or database, not accessing the content from a data source.

Furthermore, in paragraph 3.2 of the present Office Action, the assertion is made that Alexander discloses the claimed element of "associating [the] at least one discrete component of data with at least one domain." The Office Action refers to col. 6, lines 58-63 of Alexander as

allegedly disclosing this claimed element. This referenced section of Alexander, however, is actually disclosing that the content management framework 18 is logically categorized into Content Management Framework (CMF) form classes and three groups of classes relating to controls, validators, and adaptors. Alexander specifically discusses these form classes and groups of classes in the four paragraphs following this cited section. As may be seen, these paragraphs do not specifically teach actually associating a discrete component of data with at least one domain. Rather, these are classes representational of a framework object model (e.g., FIG. 5). Although this teaching may obliquely “disclose grouping of data and the classes or categories for storage within database [sic]” as alleged in the Office Action, this is not tantamount to an actual teaching of the claimed feature of “associating discrete data components with at least one domain.”

Moreover, paragraph 3.3 of the present Office Action asserts that the claimed element of “adding domain specific contextual information to set at least one discrete component of data to provide enhanced data” is also taught by Alexander. In particular, the Office Action alleges that Alexander discloses a piece of content, that is a data component, combined with metadata, which is equated with the claimed “contextual information.” In support, col. 2, lines 49-52 of Alexander and col. 6, lines 23-26 are proffered as teaching this element. Despite this assertion, Applicant submit that Alexander does not teach or suggest, even in the referenced sections, that metadata is actually added to a discrete component of data to provide enhanced data. Rather, the metadata as disclosed in the referenced section of col. 6, lines 23-26, is stored in its own metadata layer 41, which, although related to other information, is still separate (i.e., not added to) the information. Accordingly, Applicants respectively submit that Alexander does not in fact teach this element. In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectively request that the rejection of

claim 1 be reconsidered and withdrawn, as Alexander does not teach or suggest all of the elements of the claim.

With respect to claims 2-6, these claims are also allowable on their merits and for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 1, from which these claims depend. Additionally, Applicants reiterate that Alexander also does not teach or suggest the provision of enhanced data by adding contextual information to discrete data that has been accessed from a source. Thus, the features of assigning access rights to enhanced data in claim 2, assigning usage rules to enhanced data in claim 3, and encoding enhanced data with a markup language in claim 4 necessarily would not be taught by Alexander.

With respect to independent claim 9, this claim features the element of “receiving a request through at least one digital identity for enhanced data from a request, the enhanced data including added contextual information.” As argued previously, Alexander does not teach or suggest the addition of contextual information to achieve enhanced data. Accordingly, this claim is believed to be allowable for at least the reasons presented above with respect to claim 1. Additionally, with respect to claims 10 and 12, which depend from claim 9, these claims are also believed to be allowable on their merits and also due to their dependency.

With regard to claim 21, the Office Action asserts that Alexander discloses all of the claimed elements. The Applicants respectfully disagree. Claim 21, in particular, features “at least one discrete component of data,” “first contextual information that enhances...[the] discrete component of data for a first domain,” “second contextual information that enhances...[the] discrete component for a second domain,” and “the first domain [being] different from the second domain.” The Office Action relies on the teaching in lines 49-67 in column 2 of Alexander as teaching these elements. Once again, however, Applicants submit that this section

of Alexander merely teaches separate data entries, each having an accompanying set of information attributes describing the data entry element. This teaching is not the same as the claimed features because each data entry element includes within the metadata form a set of information attributes describing the respective data entry elements. In contrast, claim 21 features first and second contextual information enhancing at least one discrete component of data for respective first and second domains. That is, claim 21 features at least two types of contextual information that enhance the same at least one discrete component of data whereas Alexander is merely teaching a respective set of information attributes for each data entry element. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Alexander does not teach the elements of claim 21.

With respect to dependent claims 22-26, these claims are believed to be allowable on their merits and also for at least the reasons presented with respect to independent claim 21.

Claims 27 and 28 include elements similar to the elements found in claims 1 and 9, respectively. Accordingly, these claims are believed to be allowable at least for the same reasons presented above with respect to claims 1 and 9 and also on their own merits.

Claims 7, 14, 15 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Alexander in view of Bell, et al. (U.S. Published Application No. 20020120501). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection based on the following reasons.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references, either combined or taken separately, do not teach or suggest all of the elements of claim 7. In particular, claim 1, from which this claim depends, is first believed to be allowable and thus, claim 7 is also allowable.

Additionally, the cited section in Bell concerning the alleged teaching of processing “feedback information within a content management system” simply does not teach the claimed elements of claim 7. Specifically, Bell teaches receiving “feedback” that consists of comments from recording artists, not feedback data. Notwithstanding, even if one could characterize the taught “feedback” discussed in Bell as feedback data, Bell nonetheless does not disclose the claimed element of “modifying the enhanced data to include the feedback data.” Accordingly, Applicants submit that neither Bell nor Alexander teach or suggest all of the elements of claim 7 and the rejection should be withdrawn, accordingly.

With respect to Claims 14 and 15, these claims are believed to be allowable due to their dependency on independent claim 9, discussed above, as well as on their own merits.

Claim 25 is believed to be allowable by virtue of its dependency on claim 21 and also according to its merits.

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being patentable over Alexander in view of Bowman-Amuah (U.S. Patent No. 6,697,824). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that this claim is allowable due to its dependency on independent claim 1 and also on its merits. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 11, 13, 16-18, and 29-32 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Alexander in view of Muyres, et al. (U.S. Published Application No. 20010010046). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the following reasons.

With respect to dependent claims 11 and 13, these claims are believed to be allowable at least due to their dependency on independent claim 9, discussed previously, and also on their merits. Accordingly, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

With respect to dependent claims 17 and 18, which depend from claim 16, these claims are also believed to be allowable on their merits and at least due to their dependency on independent claim 16.

With respect to the substantive rejection of claim 29 under §103(e), Applicants note this claim includes features similar to those found in claim 16; namely, receiving content including terms of at least one service and filtering the content to determine whether the content satisfies at least one predetermined rule. Accordingly, the Applicants submit that claim 29 is also allowable over Alexander and Muyres for at least the reasons presented above with respect to claim 16.

With respect to claim 30, Applicants submit that the cited references do not teach or suggest all of the elements of Claim 30. In particular, the office action asserts that Alexander teaches, among other things, “adding domain specific contextual information to set at least one discrete component of data by the second entity to create enhanced data.” As argued previously in this response, Alexander does not actually teach adding contextual information to a discrete component of data in order to create enhanced data. Accordingly, Alexander cannot be relied upon as teaching this element. Additionally, Muyres does not make up for this deficiency.

With respect to dependent claims 31 and 32, these claims are believed to be allowable on their merits and also due to their dependency on independent claim 30.

With respect to Claims 19 and 20, rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Alexander and Muyres as applied to claim 16 and further in view of Bowman-Amuah. These claims are believed to be allowable due to their dependency on claim 16 and also are believed allowable on their merits.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is

invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 7/8/05

By: C. Reckamp  
Christopher J. Reckamp  
Registration No. 34,414

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.  
222 N. LaSalle Street  
Chicago, IL 60601  
312-609-7599  
312-609-5005 (Fax)